

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,358	07/03/2001	Fred A. Fensel	3003-37	1062
21324	7590 07/17/2003			
HAHN LOE	HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP		EXAMINER	
TWIN OAKS ESTATE 1225 W. MARKET STREET			WATKINS III,	WILLIAM P
AKRON, OH	I 44313	•	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1772	7
			DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/898,358	FENSEL ET AL.	
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	William P. Watkins III	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the composition of the compos	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriation of the fee.	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) I they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c)	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:			
			
	•		

Application No. 009/898,358

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)



Continuation of 2. NOTE: It is not clear where the broad limitation of "free of voids" is supported in the original specification. The specification appears to only mention "air entrained voids". It is not clear that applicant has support for the broader language, which woul exclude voids such as inert gases and hollow microspheres.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues that void free is not inherent in the teachings of Liang et al. The position of the examiner is that use of vacuum is an obvious teaching of the reference and that degassing of air is the taught reason for using vacuum.. The position of the examiner relies on obviousness and not inherency.

WILLIAM P. WATKINS III PRIMARY EXAMINER

Willow R. Westwir H